

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 were presented for examination and were rejected. The applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in light of the amendments and the following comments.

**35 U.S.C. 102 Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10-15**

Claims 1-8 and 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by S.S. Taylor, U.S. Patent 6,888,409 (hereinafter "Taylor"). The applicant respectfully submits that the amendments overcome the rejection.

Amended claim 1 recites:

1. A power amplifier for driving a load, the power amplifier further comprising a resistive element connected at an output thereof to maintain a low impedance at the output across a range of operational frequencies.  
*(emphasis supplied)*

Nowhere does Taylor teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what amended claim 1 recites — namely that the power amplifier is for driving a load and that the power amplifier itself further comprises a resistive element.

Taylor relates to the control of two power supplies 18, 20 through switch circuit 14 and regulator circuit 16 to regulate the voltage at an output node 22 of a power amplifier 12. Taylor discloses in Figure 1 that the power amplifier comprises a transistor M1 with an output circuit 26. Taylor further states that the RF output signal may be used to drive a load resistance 24. Taylor does not disclose a power amplifier for driving a load, the power amplifier further comprising a resistive element as specified in claim 1 of the present application.

For this reason, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

Because claims 2-8 and 10-12 depend on claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of them is also overcome.

Amended claim 13 recites:

**13.** A power amplifier circuit for driving a load, the power amplifier circuit further comprising:

a transistor for receiving a signal to be amplified at an input and for outputting an amplified signal at an output;

a modulated power supply connected to the transistor output; and

a resistive element connected at the transistor output such that a low impedance is maintained at the transistor output across a range of operational frequencies.

*(emphasis supplied)*

Nowhere does Taylor teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what amended claim 13 recites — namely that the power amplifier circuit is for driving a load and that the power amplifier circuit itself further comprises a resistive element.

For the reasons stated above and with respect to the rejection of claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 13 is overcome.

Amended claim 14 recites:

**14.** A method of maintaining a low impedance across a range of operational frequencies in a power amplifier for driving a load, the method comprising providing a resistive element at an output of the power amplifier.

*(emphasis supplied)*

Nowhere does Taylor teach or suggest, alone or in combination with the other references, what amended claim 14 recites — namely that the power amplifier is for driving a load, wherein a resistive element is provided at an output of the power amplifier.

For the reasons stated above and with respect to the rejection of claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 14 is overcome.

Because claim 15 depends on claim 14, the applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 15 is also overcome.

Further, as stated in the description of the application at page 6, lines 22 to 23, the inclusion of the resistive element reduces the Q of the parasitic resonant circuit (illustrated in the equivalent circuit of Figure 2) produced by the elements of a power amplifier design. This reduction in the Q of the resonant circuit reduces the impedance presented to the modulated power supply allowing accurate high bandwidth modulation of the power supply.

The applicant respectfully submits that the invention claimed in amended, independent claims 1, 13, and 14 is therefore inventive over the art cited by the Office.

**35 U.S.C. 103 Rejection of Claim 9**

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Taylor in view of Midya et al., U.S. Patent 6,137,358 (hereinafter "Midya").

Because claim 9 is dependent on amended claim 1 and because Midya fails to cure the deficiencies of Taylor with respect to the rejection of claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 9 is overcome.

**Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111**

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and requests that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicant respectfully requests that Examiner telephone the applicant's attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,  
Martin Paul Wilson

By /Kenneth Ottesen/  
Kenneth Ottesen  
Reg. No. 54353  
732-578-0103 x222

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.  
Suite 250  
100 Commons Way  
Holmdel, NJ 07733  
United States of America